

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 13, 2008, has been received and reviewed.

This response is directed to that action.

Claims 1, 7 and 11 have been amended and claims 4 and 6 have been cancelled. Support for the amendments can be found in claim 6 as originally filed and in paragraphs [0026] and [0033] of the published US application, 2006/0025541 A1. No new matter has been added.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification.

The Examiner objected to the specification for lacking antecedent basis for the detergent function of the water soluble filler as per claim 15. The specification has been amended herein to provide antecedent basis for the term, thus rendering this objection moot. Since term was included in claim 15 as originally filed, no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because the term “derivative” is indefinite, and the specification does not disclose any examples of a “derivative”. The amendment to claim 11 and the cancellation of claim 4 is believed to render this rejection moot. The applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-13 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by WO 01/36240 or EP 406623; and claims 1-4, 9-11 and 15-18 as anticipated by Milovac et al. (US 5,047,247), Horstmann et al. (US 5,629,003) or Horstmann et al. (US 2004/0137027 A1). The amendment to claim 1, incorporating the limitations of originally filed claim 6, is believed to render these rejections moot. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

The Examiner additionally rejected claims 1-6, 10-14 and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by EP 1180536; EO 298222; W0 98/42815; Deibig et al. (US 5,322,878); EP 457600; or JP 55-110148. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Anticipation requires that a single reference describe the claimed invention with sufficient precision and detail to establish that the subject matter existed in the prior art. See *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The applicants respectfully submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner against the presently claimed invention satisfies the requirements of a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

EP 1180536 teaches that a PVA film may comprise methacrylamidopropanesulfonic acid or salts thereof, which is a sulphonated polymer. However, the '536 reference fails to teach that this polymer is suitable for an injection moulded article.

EP 298222 teaches encapsulating bleaches through a fluidized bed method, and is completely silent as regards both sulphonated polymers being used to form injection

moulded articles.

WO 98/42815 is directed to a personal cleaning bar. While the references teaches that injection may be used to fill a mould (see page 20, line 14), there is no skin formed that comprise sulphonated polymers. Rather, cationic polymers are used instead. (See page 9).

Deibig et al. teaches injection moulded articles made from polymers, however there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion that the polymer can be a sulphonated polymer.

Similarly, EP 457600 fails to teach sulphonated polymers. Moreover, there is also no disclosure of an article made from injection moulding.

JP 55-110148 discloses an aqueous resin for a moulding material comprising aqueous formaldehyde precondensate resin, vinyl acetate resin emulsion containing alpha-oelfin maleic anhydride copolymer and filler. There is simply no teaching or suggestion of a sulphonated polymer.

Accordingly, the applicants submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner teach all of the limitations of the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, the applicants submit that anticipation cannot be established, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Milovac et al., Horstmann '003, Horstmann '027, WO 01/36290, EP 406623, EP 1180536, EP 298222, WO 98/42815, Deibig et al. EP 457600 or JP 55-

110148. The Examiner stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select applicants' ingredients from a list of equivalents. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The applicants submit that the presently claimed invention is not obvious because there is absolutely no suggestion in the prior art or the knowledge of the skilled artisan at the time of the invention that a water-soluble sulphonated polymer could be used to produce an injection moulded article. Moreover, the applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to provide a clear articulation of why the skilled artisan would make an injection moulded product from sulphonated polymers. Rather, the Examiner has merely concluded that it would have been obvious. The Supreme Court has noted that an analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements, but must be supported with some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support an obviousness rejection. *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 US ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

The applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

The applicants believe the claims are now in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain, the resolution of which can be advanced through a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number listed below.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicant respectfully requests that this be considered a petition therefor. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By M. Marin
Mark D. Marin
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 50,842
875 Third Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Tel. 212-808-0700